



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/287,304	04/07/1999	AKIRA YAMAMOTO	0941.63012	6149
24978	7590	04/15/2005	EXAMINER PIZIALI, JEFFREY J	
GREER, BURNS & CRAIN 300 S WACKER DR 25TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606			ART UNIT 2673	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/287,304	YAMAMOTO ET AL.
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Jeff Piziali	2673	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 24 March 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
  - a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
  - b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
  - (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

12 April 2005

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicants' arguments filed 24 March 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicants contend the examiner neglected to respond to arguments provided in the Amendment filed 29 June 2004. The examiner respectfully disagrees. On page 9 of the Amendment filed 29 June 2004, the applicants argue, "the cited reference [of Nakajima (US 5,654,735)] does not disclose (or suggest) a display device that can simultaneously receive and write respective display signals to a plurality of data signal lines" (see the first paragraph of page 9). This argument is directly and compressively rebutted in the "Response to Arguments" section (see pages 8-9) of the Final Office Action mailed 29 December 2004. Simply because the applicants may disagree with the examiner's rebuttal and reading of the prior art does not justify inaccurately claiming that no rebuttal has been provided. In fact, in Applicants' arguments filed 24 March 2005, after charging the examiner with failing to provide a rebuttal (in the first paragraph on page 2), the applicants abruptly then proceed to dispute the examiner's supposedly nonexistent rebuttal (in the third paragraph on page 2).

To actual claim matters under dispute, the applicants contend the cited prior art of Nakajima (US 5,654,735) neglects to teach, "the simultaneous supply of display signals from the signal lines to the data bus lines, and from the data bus lines to the signal lines" (see the first paragraph on page 3). However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Namely, the claims recite no such language. Instead, for instance, independent claim 1 recites, "said display signals simultaneously being supplied from and written to the plurality of signal lines to and from the data bus lines respectively" (see lines 14-16). Nakajima explicitly discloses a display device [Fig. 1; 1] that can simultaneously receive and write respective display signals [Fig. 1; VIDEO, SIG1-SIG3] to a plurality of data signal lines [Fig. 1; blocks Vn, Vn+1, etc.] (see Column 3, Line 64 - Column 6, Line 5). Nakajima states, "The display panel has pixels arrayed at intersections of mutually orthogonal gate lines and data lines, and a driving circuit for sampling a plurality of video signals simultaneously and distributing the sampled video signals concurrently to a predetermined number of data lines" (see Column 2, Lines 33-38 – emphasis added). In such a manner, Nakajima clearly teaches the claimed subject matter of display signals [Fig. 1; VIDEO] simultaneously being supplied from and written to the plurality of signal lines [Fig. 1; VIDEO & SIG1-SIG3 electrodes] to and from the data bus lines [Fig. 1; Vn, Vn+1, etc.] respectively (Column 3, Line 64 - Column 6, Line 5).

The applicants additionally contend the cited prior art is "incapable of realizing the advantageous results of the present invention" (see the first paragraph on page 5). However, such arguable "features and advantages as in the present invention" have not been incorporated into any pending claim language. By such reasoning, rejection of the claims is deemed necessary, proper, and thereby maintained at this time.



BIPIN SHALWALA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800